arXiv:1506.01506v3 [math.CV] 31 Aug 2015

WEAK SOLUTION OF PARABOLIC COMPLEX MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATION

DO HOANG SON

ABSTRACT. We study the equation $\dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + f(z,t)$ in domains of $\mathbb{C}^n$. This equation has a close connection with the Kähler-Ricci flow. In this paper, we consider the case where the boundary condition is smooth and the initial condition is irregular.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
2. Preliminaries 4
3. Some properties of weak solutions 6
4. Proof of Theorem 1.2 13
5. A priori estimates 16
6. Proof of Theorem 1.4 24
References 27

Date: September 1, 2015.

1. Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded smooth strictly pseudoconvex domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$, i.e., there exists a smooth strictly plurisubharmonic function ρ defined on a bounded neighbourhood of $\bar{\Omega}$ such that

$$\Omega = \{\rho < 0\}.$$

Let $A \geq 0, T > 0$. We consider the equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + f(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ u = u_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $\dot{u} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$, $u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta}$, u_0 is a plurisubharmonic function in a neighbourhood of $\bar{\Omega}$ and φ, f are smooth in $\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T]$.

If u_0 is a smooth strictly plurisubharmonic function on $\bar{\Omega}$ and satisfies the compatibility condition on $\partial\Omega \times \{0\}$

$$\dot{\varphi} = \log\det(u_0)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_0 + f(z,0),$$

then (1) admits a unique smooth solution [HL10]. After studying the case where u_0 is continuous or just bounded [Do15], we want to understand the situation when u_0 is a more general plurisubharmonic functions, first with zero Lelong numbers, then in some special cases where positive Lelong numbers are involved.

On compact Kähler manifolds, the corresponding problem was considered and solved [GZ13, DL14]. By using approximations and a priori estimates, it was shown that the Parabolic complex Monge-Ampère equation admits a unique solution in a sense close to classical solution. We expect that a similar situation obtains on the domain Ω.

In order to study the situation with irregular initial data, we give a notion of "weak solution" for (1), consider the existence of weak solutions, and "describe" weak solutions in some particular cases.

The function $u \in USC(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ (upper semicontinuous function) is called a *weak solution* of (1) if there exist $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} u_m(.,t) \in SPSH(\Omega), & \\ \dot{u}_m = \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u_m \searrow \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ u_m \searrow u_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}, \\ u = \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} u_m. & \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $SPSH(\Omega) = \{\text{strictly plurisubharmonic functions on } \Omega\}$.

For the convenience, we also denote by k_A the functions

$$\begin{cases} k_A(x,t) = x - 2nt \quad \text{if} \quad A = 0, \\ k_A(x,t) = -\frac{2n}{A} + \left(\frac{2n}{A} + x\right) e^{-At} \quad \text{if} \quad A > 0, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $x > 0$ and $0 < t < T$, and by ϵ_A the value of t such that $k_A(x,t) = 0$:

$$\begin{cases} \epsilon_A(x) = \frac{x}{2n} \text{ if } A = 0, \\ \epsilon_A(x) = \frac{1}{A}(\log(Ax + 2n) - \log(2n)) \text{ if } A > 0. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Our main results are the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $A \geq 0, T > 0$ and Ω be a bounded smooth strictly pseudoconvex domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let φ, f be smooth functions in $\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T]$ and u_0 be a plurisubharmonic function in a neighbourhood of $\bar{\Omega}$ such that $u_0(z) = \varphi(z,0)$ for any $z \in \partial\Omega$. Then* (1) *has a unique weak solution.*

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Suppose also that u_0 has zero Lelong numbers, i.e.,*

$$\nu_{u_0}(a) = \lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\sup_{|z-a|<r} u_0(z)}{\log r} = 0,$$

for any $z \in \Omega$. Then the weak solution u satisfies

(a) $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times (0,T))$.
(b) $\dot{u} = \log\det u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au + f(z,t)$ *in* $\bar{\Omega} \times (0,T)$.
(c) $u(.,t) \xrightarrow{L^1} u_0$ *as* $t \searrow 0$; $u|_{\partial\Omega \times [0,T)} = \varphi|_{\partial\Omega \times [0,T)}$.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. If there is $a \in \Omega$ such that the Lelong number of u_0 at a is positive then there is no $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times (0,T))$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} u(.,t) \in SPSH(\bar{\Omega}), & \forall t \in (0,T), \\ \dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + f(z,t) & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times (0,T), \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ u(.,t) \xrightarrow{L^1} u_0. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Suppose also that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{l} n_j \log|z - a_j| + C_0 \geq u_0 \geq \sum_{j=1}^{l} N_j \log|z - a_j| - C_0,$$

where $l \in \mathbb{N}, a_j \in \Omega, N_j \geq n_j > 0$. Then the weak solution u satisfies

(a) $u \in C^\infty(Q)$, *where* $Q = (\bar{\Omega} \times (0,T)) \setminus (\cup(\{a_j\} \times (0, \epsilon_A(n_j)]))$.
(b) $u = -\infty$ *on* $\cup(\{a_j\} \times [0, \min\{T, \epsilon_A(N_j)\}))$.
Moreover, if $n_j = N_j$ then

$$\nu_{u(.,t)}(a_j) = k(N_j, t),$$

for any $0 < t < \min\{T, \epsilon_A(N_j)\}$.
(c) $\dot{u} = \log\det u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au + f(z,t)$ *in* Q.

(d) $u(.,t) \xrightarrow{L^1} u_0$ *when* $t \searrow 0$; $u|_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T)} = \varphi|_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T)}$.
Moreover, $u(.,t) \to u_0$ *"uniformly in capacity", i.e., if* $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $\bar{\Omega} \Subset \tilde{\Omega}$ *then there exists an open set* U_ϵ *such that*

$$Cap_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\bar{\Omega} \setminus U_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon,$$
$$u(.,t) \rightrightarrows u_0 \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \cap U_\epsilon \text{ as } t \searrow 0.$$

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Hou-Li theorem.**

The Hou-Li theorem states that equation (1) has a unique solution when the conditions are good enough. We state the precise problem to be studied:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) + f(t,z,u) & \text{on } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times[0,T), \\ u = u_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega}\times\{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

We first need the notion of a subsolution to (6).

Definition 2.1. *A function* $\underline{u} \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ *is called a* subsolution *of the equation* (6) *if and only if*

$$\begin{cases} \underline{u}(.,t) \text{is a strictly plurisubharmonic function,} \\ \dot{\underline{u}} \leq \log\det(\underline{u})_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + f(t,z,\underline{u}), \\ \underline{u}|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)} = \varphi|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)}, \\ \underline{u}(.,0) \leq u_0. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ *be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Let* $T \in (0,\infty]$. *Assume that*

- φ *is a smooth function in* $\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T)$.
- f *is a smooth function in* $[0,T)\times\bar{\Omega}\times\mathbb{R}$ *non increasing in the lastest variable.*
- u_0 *is a smooth strictly plurisubharmonic funtion in a neighborhood of* Ω.
- $u_0(z) = \varphi(z,0)$, $\forall z \in \partial\Omega$.
- *The compatibility condition is satisfied, i.e.*

$$\dot{\varphi} = \log\det(u_0)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + f(t,z,u_0), \ \ \forall (z,t) \in \partial\Omega\times\{0\}.$$

- *There exists a subsolution to the equation* (6).

Then there exists a unique solution $u \in C^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T)) \cap C^{2;1}(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ *of the equation* (6).

Remark 2.3. (i) *There is a corresponding result in the case of a compact Kähler manifold* [Cao85]. *On the compact Kähler manifold* X, *we must assume that* $0 < T < T_{max}$, *where* T_{max} *depends on* X. *In the case of domain* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, *we can assume that* $T = +\infty$ *if* $\varphi, \underline{u}$ *are defined on* $\bar{\Omega}\times[0,+\infty)$ *and* f *is defined on* $[0,+\infty)\times\bar{\Omega}\times\mathbb{R}$.

(ii) *If* Ω *is a bounded smooth strictly pseudoconvex domain of* $\mathbb{C}^n$ *then one can prove that a subsolution always exists on* $\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T')$, *for any* $0 < T' < T$, *and so Theorem 2.2 does not need the additional assumption of existence of a subsolution.*

2.2. **Maximum principle.**

The following maximum principle is a basic tool to establish upper and lower bounds in the sequel (see [BG13] and [IS13] for the proof).

Theorem 2.4. *Let* Ω *be a bounded domain of* C^n *and* $T > 0$. *Let* $\{\omega_t\}_{0<t<T}$ *be a continuous family of continuous positive definite Hermitian forms on* Ω. *Denote by* Δ_t *the Laplacian with respect to* ω_t*:*

$$\Delta_t f = \frac{n\omega_t^{n-1} \wedge dd^c f}{\omega_t^n},\ \forall f \in C^\infty(\Omega).$$

Suppose that $H \in C^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T)) \cap C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ *and satisfies*

$$(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta_t)H \leq 0 \ \ or\ \ \dot{H}_t \leq \log \frac{(\omega_t + dd^c H_t)^n}{\omega_t^n}.$$

Then $\sup\limits_{\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T)} H = \sup\limits_{\partial_P(\Omega\times[0,T))} H$. *Here we denote* $\partial_P(\Omega \times (0,T)) = (\partial\Omega \times (0,T)) \cup \big(\bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}\big)$.

Corollary 2.5. *(Comparison principle) Let* Ω *be a bounded domain of* $\mathbb{C}^n$ *and* $A \geq 0, T > 0$. *Let* $u, v \in C^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T)) \cap C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ *satisfy:*

- $u(.,t)$ *and* $v(.,t)$ *are strictly plurisubharmonic functions for any* $t \in [0,T)$,
- $\dot{u} \leq \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + f(z,t)$,
- $\dot{v} \geq \log\det(v_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Av + f(z,t)$,

where $f \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$.
Then $\sup\limits_{\Omega\times(0,T)} (u - v) \leq max\{0, \sup\limits_{\partial_P(\Omega\times(0,T))} (u - v)\}$.

Corollary 2.6. *Let* Ω *be a bounded domain of* $\mathbb{C}^n$ *and* $T > 0$. *We denote by* L *the operator on* $C^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))$ *given by*

$$L(f) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} - \sum a_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta} - b.f,$$

where $a_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}, b \in C(\Omega \times (0,T))$, $(a_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(z,t))$ *are positive definite Hermitian matrices and* $b(z,t) < 0$.
Assume that $\phi \in C^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T)) \cap C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ *satisfies*

$$L(\phi) \leq 0.$$

Then $\phi \leq max(0, \sup\limits_{\partial_P(\Omega\times(0,T))} \phi)$.

2.3. **The Laplacian inequalities.**

We shall need two standard auxiliary results (see [Yau78], [Siu87] for a proof).

Theorem 2.7. *Let* ω_1, ω_2 *be positive* $(1,1)$*-forms on a complex manifold* X*.Then*

$$n\left(\frac{\omega_1^n}{\omega_2^n}\right)^{1/n} \leq tr_{\omega_2}(\omega_1) \leq n\left(\frac{\omega_1^n}{\omega_2^n}\right)(tr_{\omega_1}(\omega_2))^{n-1},$$

where $tr_{\omega_1}(\omega_2) = \dfrac{n\omega_1^{n-1} \wedge \omega_2}{\omega_1^n}$.

Remark 2.8. *Applying Theorem 2.7 for* $\omega_1 = dd^c u$ *and* $\omega_2 = dd^c|z|^2$*, we have*

$$n(\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}))^{1/n} \leq \Delta u \leq n(\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}))(\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}})^{n-1}.$$

Theorem 2.9. *Let* ω*,* ω' *be two Kähler forms on a complex manifold* X*. If the holomorphic bisectional curvature of* ω *is bounded below by a constant* $B \in \mathbb{R}$ *on* X*,then*

$$\Delta_{\omega'} \log tr_\omega(\omega') \geq -\frac{tr_\omega Ric(\omega')}{tr_\omega(\omega')} + B\, tr_{\omega'}(\omega),$$

where $Ric(\omega')$ *is the form associated to the Ricci curvature of* ω'*.*

Remark 2.10. *Applying Theorem 2.9 for* $\omega = dd^c|z|^2$ *and* $\omega' = dd^c u$*, we have*

$$\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(\log \Delta u)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \geq \frac{\Delta \log \det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})}{\Delta u}.$$

3. Some properties of weak solutions

In this section, we assume that Ω is a bounded smooth strictly pseudoconvex domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$, $A \geq 0$, $T > 0$.

We will study some properties of the weak solutions of (1). The proof of Theorem 1.1 and the proof of Theorem 1.3 are contained in this section. Theorem 1.1 is the union of Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.4. Theorem 1.3 is a corollary of Proposition 3.9 and Proposition 3.10.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that there exists* $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T))$ *satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} u_m(.,t) \in SPSH(\Omega) & \forall t \in [0,T), \\ u_m(z,t) + 2^{-m} \geq u_{m+1}(z,t) & \forall (z,t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0,T), \\ \dot{u}_m = \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z,t) & \forall (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u_m(z,t) \longrightarrow \varphi(z,t) & \forall (z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ u_m(z,0) \longrightarrow u_0(z) & \forall z \in \bar{\Omega}. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Then $u = \lim u_m$ *is a weak solution of* (1)*.*

Proof. Set $v_m = u_m + 2^{-m+1}e^{-At+AT}$. We have

$$v_m - v_{m+1} = (u_m + 2^{-m} - u_{m+1}) + 2^{-m}(e^{-At+AT} - 1) \geq 0.$$

Thus the sequence $\{v_m\}$ is decreasing, and

$$v_m \searrow \varphi \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T),$$
$$v_m \searrow u_0 \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}.$$

Moreover, it follows from (8) that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_m &= \dot{u}_m - A.2^{-m+1}e^{-At+AT} \\ &= \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z,t) - A2^{-m+1}.e^{-At+AT} \\ &= \log\det(v_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Av_m + f(z,t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $u = \lim v_m = \lim u_m$ is a weak solution of (1). ☐

Proposition 3.2. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, there exists a weak solution of* (1).

Proof. Using the convolution of $u_0 + \frac{|z|^2}{m}$ with smooth kernels, we can take $u_{0,m} \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \cap SPSH(\bar{\Omega})$ such that

$$u_{0,m} \searrow u_0. \tag{9}$$

Note that $u_0|_{\partial\Omega}$ is continuous. Then

$$\delta_m = \sup_{z\in\partial\Omega} (u_{0,m}(z) - u_0(z)) \overset{m\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{10}$$

We define $g_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\varphi_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ by

$$g_m = \log\det(u_{0,m})_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_{0,m} + f(z,0),$$
$$\varphi_m = \zeta(\frac{t}{\epsilon_m})(tg_m + u_{0,m}) + (1 - \zeta(\frac{t}{\epsilon_m}))\varphi,$$

where ζ is a smooth function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that ζ is decreasing, $\zeta|_{(-\infty,1]} = 1$ and $\zeta|_{[2,\infty)} = 0$. $\epsilon_m > 0$ are chosen such that the sequences $\{\epsilon_m\}$, $\{\epsilon_m \sup|g_m|\}$ are decreasing to 0.

$u_{0,m}$ and φ_m satisfy the compatibility condition. By Theorem 2.2, there exists $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_m = \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u_m = \varphi_m & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ u_m = u_{0,m} & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

It follows from (10) that, for any $m > 0$,

$\varphi_m \geq \zeta(\frac{t}{\epsilon_m})u_0 + (1 - \zeta(\frac{t}{\epsilon_m}))\varphi - 2\epsilon_m \sup|g_m|,$
$\varphi_m \leq \zeta(\frac{t}{\epsilon_m})u_0 + (1 - \zeta(\frac{t}{\epsilon_m}))\varphi + 2\epsilon_m \sup|g_m| + \delta_m.$

where $(z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T)$.

Then

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T)} |\varphi_m - \varphi| \leq \sup_{\partial\Omega\times[0,2\epsilon_m]} |\varphi - u_0| + 2\epsilon_m \sup|g_m| + \delta_m.$$

Note that $u_0(z) = \varphi(z,0)$ for any $z \in \partial\Omega$. Hence

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T)} |\varphi_m - \varphi| \overset{m\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Then we can choose a subsequence $\{\varphi_{m_k}\}$ such that

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T)} |\varphi_{m_k} - \varphi| \leq 2^{-k-1}. \tag{12}$$

for any $k > 0$.

Using (9), (12) and applying Corollary 2.5, we have

$$u_{m_k} + 2^{-k} \geq u_{m_{k+1}}.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $u = \lim u_{m_k}$ is a weak solution of (1). □

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that u is a weak solution of* (1) *and v is a weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v} = \log\det(v_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Av + g(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ v = \psi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ v = v_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where v_0 is a plurisubharmonic function in a neighbourhood of $\bar{\Omega}$ and g, ψ are smooth functions in $\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T]$. If there are $A_1, A_2, A_3 \geq 0$ such that

$$u_0 \leq v_0 + A_1,$$
$$\varphi|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)} \leq \psi|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)} + A_2,$$
$$f \leq g + A_3,$$

then $u \leq v + \max\{A_1, A_2\} + A_3 T$.

Proof. Assume that $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_m(.,t) \in SPSH(\Omega) & \\ \dot{u}_m = \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u_m \searrow \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ u_m \searrow u_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

and that $v_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} v_m(.,t) \in SPSH(\Omega) & \\ \dot{v}_m = \log\det(v_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Av_m + g(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ v_m \searrow \psi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ v_m \searrow v_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

Fix $m > 0, \epsilon > 0, 0 < T' < T$. We need to show that there exists $k_m > 0$ satisfying

$$u_{k_m} \leq v_m + \max\{A_1, A_2\} + A_3 T + \epsilon, \quad \forall (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T'). \tag{16}$$

Indeed, if we denote $w_m = v_m + A_3 t$ then

$$\dot{w}_m \geq \log\det(w_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Aw_m + g(z,t) + A_3 \geq \log\det(w_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Aw_m + f(z,t)$$

It follows from Corollary 2.5 that

$$u_k - v_m = u_k - w_m + A_3 t \leq \sup_{\partial_P(\Omega\times(0,T'))} (u_k - w_m) + A_3 T, \quad \forall k > 0, (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T').$$

Note that

$$\cap_{k>0}\{(z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T'] : u_k(z,t) \geq w_m(z,t) + A_2 + \epsilon\} = \emptyset.$$

By the compactness of $\partial\Omega \times [0,T']$, there exists $k_m^{'} > 0$ such that

$$\cap_{k<k_m^{'}}\{(z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T'] : u_k(z,t) \geq w_m(z,t) + A_2 + \epsilon\} = \emptyset.$$

By the monotonicity of $\{u_k\}$, we have

$$u_{k_m^{'}}(z,t) < w_m(z,t) + A_2 + \epsilon, \quad \forall (z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T'].$$

Similarly, there exists $k_m^{''} > 0$ such that

$$u_{k_m^{''}}(z,0) < w_m(z,0) + A_1 + \epsilon, \quad \forall z \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Denote $k_m = \max\{k_m^{'}, k_m^{''}\}$. We have

$$\sup_{\partial_P(\Omega\times(0,T'))}(u_{k_m} - w_m) \leq \max\{A_1, A_2\} + \epsilon.$$

Then

$$u_{k_m} \leq v_m + \max\{A_1, A_2\} + A_3 T + \epsilon, \ \ \forall (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0, T').$$

When $m \to \infty$, we obtain

$$u \leq v + \max\{A_1, A_2\} + A_3 T + \epsilon, \ \ \forall (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0, T').$$

When $\epsilon \to 0$ and $T' \to T$, we obtain

$$u \leq v + \max\{A_1, A_2\} + A_3 T, \ \ \forall (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0, T).$$

□

Corollary 3.4. *The weak solution of* (1) *is unique.*

Remark 3.5. *By Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.4, if* $0 < T' < T$ *and* v *is the weak solution of* (1) *on* $\bar\Omega \times [0, T')$ *then*

$$v = u|_{\bar\Omega\times[0,T')},$$

where u *is the weak solution of* (1) *on* $\bar\Omega \times [0,T)$.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume that* ψ_m, g_m *are smooth functions in* $\bar\Omega \times [0,T]$ *and* $v_{0,m}$ *is a plurisubharmonic function in a neighbourhood of* $\bar\Omega$ *satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \psi_m \searrow \varphi, \ g_m \searrow f, \ v_{0,m} \searrow u_0, \\ v_{0,m}|_{\partial\Omega} = \psi_m(.,0)|_{\partial\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

Suppose that $v_m \in USC(\bar\Omega \times [0,T))$ *is the weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \dot v_m = \log\det (v_m)_{\alpha\bar\beta} - A v_m + g_m(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ v_m = \psi_m & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ v_m = v_{0,m} & \text{on } \bar\Omega \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

Then $v_m \searrow u$*, where* u *is the weak solution of* (1).

Proof. By Proposition 3.3, we have

$$v_1 \geq v_2 \geq ... \geq v_m \geq ... \geq u.$$

We need to show that $\lim v_m \leq u$.
Let $0 < T' < T$ and $\epsilon > 0$. By Dini's theorem, there exists $m_1 > 0$ such that

$$\psi_{m_1} < \varphi + \epsilon \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T'],$$
$$g_{m_1} < f + \epsilon \text{ on } \bar\Omega \times [0, T'].$$

Assume that $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega \times [0,T))$ satisfies (14). Fix $k > 0$. Let h be a harmonic function in $\bar\Omega$ such that $h|_{\partial\Omega} = u_k(.,0)|_{\partial\Omega}$. Then there exists a subset $K \Subset \Omega$ such that

$$(h - u_k(.,0))|_{\bar\Omega\setminus K} \leq \epsilon.$$

Note that

$$v_{0,m_1} - h \leq \sup_{\partial\Omega}(v_{0,m_1} - h) \leq \sup_{\partial\Omega}(v_{0,m_1} - u_0) \leq \epsilon.$$

Then $(v_{0,m_1} - u_k(.,0))|_{\bar\Omega\setminus K} \leq 2\epsilon$.

Moreover, by Hartogs lemma, there exists $m_2 > 0$ such that

$$(v_{0,m_2} - u_k(.,0))|_K \leq \epsilon.$$

Then, for any $m > \max\{m_1, m_2\}$, we have

$$\begin{gathered} \psi_m < u_k + \epsilon \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T'], \\ g_m < f + \epsilon \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T'], \\ v_{0,m} \leq u_k(.,0) + 2\epsilon \text{ on } \bar{\Omega}. \end{gathered}$$

It follows from Proposition 3.3 that

$$v_m(z,t) \leq u_k(z,t) + (T+2)\epsilon \text{ on } \Omega \times (0, T').$$

Then

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} v_m(z,t) \leq u_k(z,t) + (T+2)\epsilon \text{ on } \Omega \times (0, T').$$

When $k \to \infty$, $\epsilon \to 0$ and $T' \to T$, we obtain

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} v_m \leq u.$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that* $\psi, g \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T])$. *Assume that* $v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0,T))$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} v(.,t) \in SPSH(\bar{\Omega}), \\ \dot{v} = \log\det(v_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Av + g(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ v = \psi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T). \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Then

$$v(z,t) - v(z,0) \geq -C(t),$$

for any $(z,t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0,T)$. *Here* $C(t)$ *is defined by*

$$C(t) = \inf_{1>\epsilon>0}((-n\log\epsilon + A\sup|\psi| + \sup|g|)t - \epsilon\inf\rho) + \sup_{t'\in[0,t]}\sup_{z\in\partial\Omega}|\psi(z,t') - \psi(z,0)|,$$

where $\rho \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ *such that* $dd^c\rho \geq dd^c|z|^2$ *and* $\rho|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$.

Proof. Fix $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and $0 < t_0 < T$. Denote

$$A_\epsilon = -n\log\epsilon + A\sup|\psi| + \sup|g|,$$

$$\delta_{t_0} = \sup_{t\in[0,t_0]}\sup_{z\in\partial\Omega}|\psi(z,t) - \psi(z,0)|.$$

We consider

$$w(z,t) = v(z,0) - A_\epsilon t + \epsilon\rho(z) - \delta_{t_0}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} - \log\det w_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + Aw - g &\leq -A_\epsilon - n\log\epsilon - \log\det\rho_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + A\sup w + \sup|g| \\ &\leq -A_\epsilon - n\log\epsilon + A\sup\psi + \sup|g| \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{gathered} w(z,0) \leq v(z,0) \text{ on } \bar{\Omega}, \\ w(z,t) \leq v(z,0) - \delta_{t_0} \leq v(z,t) \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [0, t_0). \end{gathered}$$

Applying Corollary 2.5, we obtain

$$v(z,t) \geq w(z,t) = v(z,0) - A_\epsilon t + \epsilon\rho(z) - \delta_{t_0},\ \ \forall (z,t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, t_0).$$

Thus

$$v(z,t_0) \geq v(z,0) - \inf_{1>\epsilon>0} \{A_\epsilon t_0 - \epsilon \inf \rho\} - \delta_{t_0}.$$

□

Remark 3.8. *Under the conditions of Lemma 3.7, $C(t)$ is an increasing function satisfying*

$$\lim_{t\to 0} C(t) = 0.$$

Proposition 3.9. *If a function $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times (0,T))$ satisfies*

$$(18) \qquad \begin{cases} u(.,t) \in SPSH(\Omega), & \\ \dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + f(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ u(.,t) \xrightarrow{L^1} u_0. & \end{cases}$$

Then u is the weak solution of (1).

Proof. By Lemma 3.7, there exists $t_m \searrow 0$ such that

$$(19) \qquad u(z, t_m + t) \geq u(z, t_{m+1} + t) - 2^{-m},\ \ \forall (z,t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T - t_m).$$

By the condition "$u(.,t) \xrightarrow{L^1} u_0$", we have

$$u(.,t_m) + 2^{-m+1} \searrow u_0.$$

Passing to a subsequence, we can assume that

$$f(z, t_m + t) + 2^{-m+1} \searrow f(z,t),$$

$$\varphi(z, t_m + t) + 2^{-m+1} \searrow \varphi(z,t).$$

Fix $k > 0$. For any $m > k$, $u_m = u(., t_m + .) \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \times [0, T - t_k))$ is the solution of equation

$$(20) \qquad \begin{cases} \dot{u}_m = \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z, t_m + t) & \forall (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0, T - t_k), \\ u_m(z,0) = u(z,t_m), & \forall z \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_m(z,t) = u(z, t_m + t), & \forall (z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0, T - t_k). \end{cases}$$

Let $v_m \in USC(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T - t_k))$ be the weak solution of equation

$$(21) \qquad \begin{cases} \dot{v}_m = \log\det(v_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Av_m + f(z, t_m + t) + 2^{-m+1} & \text{on } \Omega \times (0, T - t_k), \\ v_m(z,0) = u(z,t_m) + 2^{-m+1}, & \text{on } \bar{\Omega}, \\ v_m(z,t) = \varphi(z, t_m + t) + 2^{-m+1}, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T - t_k). \end{cases}$$

Applying Proposition 3.6, we have

$$v_m \searrow v,$$

where v is the weak solution of (1) on $\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T - t_k)$.

Applying Proposition 3.3, we have

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T-t_k)} |u_m - v_m| \overset{m\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Then

$$u(z,t) = \lim u_m(z,t) = \lim v_m(z,t) = v(z,t), \ \ \forall (z,t)\in\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T-t_k).$$

Hence u is the weak solution of (1) on $\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T-t_k)$.

When $k\to\infty$, we have u is the weak solution of (1) on $\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T)$. □

Proposition 3.10. *If there is $a\in\Omega$ such that $\nu_{u_0}(a)>0$, then the weak solution u of* (1) *satisfies $u(a,t)=-\infty$ for $t\in[0,\epsilon_A(\nu_{u_0}(a)))$.*

Proof. We need to show that $u(a,t)=-\infty$ for $t\in[0,\epsilon_A(\nu))$ when $0<\nu<\nu_{u_0}(a)$, so that we have

$$\begin{cases} u_0 \leq \nu\log|z-a| + B_1, & \forall z\in\bar{\Omega},\\ \varphi\leq \nu\log|z-a| + B_1, & \forall (z,t)\in\partial\Omega\times[0,T), \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $B_1>0$ is given.

Let $\chi:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}_+$ be a smooth increasing convex function such that $\chi|_{(-\infty,-1)}=0$, $\chi|_{(1,\infty)}=Id$. For any m, we denote

$$w_m(z) = \chi(\log|z-a|+m) - m.$$

We will show that there exists $B>0$ such that

$$v_m(z,t) = g(t)w_m(z) + |z|^2 + B(t+1) \geq u(z,t),$$

for any $m>0$ and $(z,t)\in\bar{\Omega}\times[0,\epsilon_A(\nu))$. Here $g(t)=k_A(\nu,t)$ as in (3).

It is easy to show that

$$\dot{v}_m(z,t) + Av_m(z,t) \geq -2nw_m(z) + B, \ \ \forall (z,t)\in\bar{\Omega}\times[0,\epsilon_A(\nu)).$$

When $|z-a|<e^{-m-1}$, we have $w_m=-m$, $|D^2w_m|=0$. Then

$$\dot{v}_m - \log\det(v_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + Av_m - f(z,t) \geq 2mn + B - f(z,t) \tag{23}$$

When $|z-a|\geq e^{-m-1}$, we have

$w_m \leq \log|z-a| + 2,$
$|(w_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}| \leq \frac{B_2}{|z-a|^2},$

where $B_2>0$ is independent of m. Then

$$\log\det(v_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = \log\det(g(t)w_m + |z|^2)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \leq \log\frac{B_3}{|z-a|^{2n}},$$

where $B_3>0$ is independent of m.

Hence

$$\dot{v}_m - \log\det(v_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + Av_m - f(z,t) \geq -4n - \log B_3 + B - f(z,t). \tag{24}$$

By (22), (23) and (24), there exists $B > 0$ such that, for any m,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v}_m - \log\det(v_m)_{\alpha\bar\beta} + Av_m - f(z,t) \geq 0 & \forall (z,t) \in \Omega \times (0, \epsilon_A(\nu)), \\ v_m(z,0) \geq u_0(z), & \forall z \in \bar\Omega, \\ v_m(z,t) \geq \varphi(z,t), & \forall (z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0, \epsilon_A(\nu)). \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Applying Proposition 3.3, we have

$$v_m \geq u \text{ on } \bar\Omega \times [0, \epsilon_A(\nu)).$$

When $m \to \infty$, we obtain

$$g(t)\log|z-a| + |z|^2 + B(t+1) \geq u(z,t), \ \ \forall (z,t) \in \bar\Omega \times [0, \epsilon_A(\nu)).$$

In particular, $u(a,t) = -\infty$ for $t \in [0, \epsilon_A(\nu))$. □

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

4.1. Bounds on $\dot{\mathbf{u}}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that $u \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega \times [0,T))$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar\beta}) - Au + g(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = \varphi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T). \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

Then the following hold

(i) If $A = 0$ then

$$\frac{u(z,t) - \sup u_0}{t} - B \leq \dot{u}(z,t) \leq \frac{u(z,t) - u_0(z)}{t} + B, \ \ \forall (z,t) \in \bar\Omega \times [0,T),$$

where $B = 2\sup|\dot\varphi| + T\sup|\dot g| + n$ and $u_0 = u(.,0)$.

(ii) If $A > 0$ then

$$\frac{A}{e^{At}-1}(u - e^{At}\sup(u_0)_+) - B \leq \dot{u} \leq \frac{A}{e^{At}-1}(u - u_0) + B,$$

where $B = 2\sup|\dot\varphi| + T\sup|\dot g| + n$ and $u_0 = u(.,0)$ and $(u_0)_+ = \max\{u_0, 0\}$.

Proof. We denote by L the operator

$$L(\phi) = \dot\phi - \sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}\phi_{\alpha\bar\beta} + A\phi, \ \ \forall \phi \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega \times [0,T)),$$

where $(u^{\alpha\bar\beta})$ is the transpose of the inverse of the Hessian matrix $(u_{\alpha\bar\beta})$.

(i) When $A = 0$, we have, for any $B > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} L(t\dot u - u + u_0 - Bt) &= t\ddot u + \dot u - \dot u - B - t\sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}\dot u_{\alpha\bar\beta} + \sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}u_{\alpha\bar\beta} - \sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}(u_0)_{\alpha\bar\beta} \\ &= tg_t - B + n - \sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}(u_0)_{\alpha\bar\beta} \\ &\leq T\sup|\dot g| - B + n. \\ L(t\dot u - u + Bt) &= t\ddot u + \dot u - \dot u + B - t\sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}\dot u_{\alpha\bar\beta} + \sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}u_{\alpha\bar\beta} \\ &= B + n + t\dot g \\ &\leq B + n - T\sup|\dot g|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $B \geq T\sup|\dot{g}| + n$, we have

$$\begin{gathered} L(t\dot{u} - u + u_0 - Bt) \leq 0, \\ L(t\dot{u} - u + Bt) \geq 0. \end{gathered}$$

It follows from Corollary 2.6 that, for any $B \geq 2\sup|\dot{\varphi}| + T\sup|\dot{g}| + n$,

$$\begin{gathered} t\dot{u} - u + u_0 - Bt \leq \sup\nolimits_{\partial_P(\Omega\times[0,T))}(t\dot{u} - u + u_0 - Bt) \leq 0. \\ t\dot{u} - u + Bt \geq \inf\nolimits_{\partial_P(\Omega\times[0,T))}(t\dot{u} - u + Bt) \geq -\sup u_0. \end{gathered}$$

Hence, if $B = 2\sup|\dot{\varphi}| + T\sup|\dot{g}| + n$ then

$$\frac{u(z,t) - \sup u_0}{t} - B \leq \dot{u}(z,t) \leq \frac{u(z,t) - u_0(z)}{t} + B,$$

for any $(z,t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0,T)$.

(ii)When $A > 0$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} L(\frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}u) & = \frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\ddot{u} + e^{-At}\dot{u} - e^{-At}\dot{u} + Ae^{-At}u - \frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}\dot{u}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \\ & +e^{-At}\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + A(\frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}u) \\ & = \frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{g} + e^{-At}n, \\ L(e^{-At}u_0) & = -Ae^{-At}u_0 - e^{-At}\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(u_0)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + Ae^{-At}u_0 \leq 0, \\ L(Bt) & = B + ABt, \end{array}$$

where $B > 0$.

Then, for any $B \geq T\sup|\dot{g}| + n$, we have

$$\begin{gathered} L(\frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}(u - u_0) - Bt) \leq 0, \\ L(\frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}u + Bt) \geq 0. \end{gathered}$$

It follows from Corollary 2.6 that, for any $B \geq 2\sup|\dot{\varphi}| + T\sup|\dot{g}| + n$,

$$\frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}(u-u_0) - Bt \leq \sup_{\partial_P(\Omega\times[0,T))}(\frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}(u-u_0) - Bt) \leq 0,$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}u + Bt \geq \inf_{\partial_P(\Omega\times[0,T))}(\frac{1-e^{-At}}{A}\dot{u} - e^{-At}u + Bt) & \geq -\sup(e^{-At}u_0) \\ & \geq -\sup(u_0)_+. \end{array}$$

Hence, if $B = 2\sup|\dot{\varphi}| + T\sup|\dot{g}| + n$ then

$$\frac{A}{e^{At}-1}\left(u - e^{At}\sup(u_0)_+\right) - B\frac{At}{1-e^{-At}} \leq \dot{u} \leq \frac{A}{e^{At}-1}(u - u_0) + B\frac{At}{1-e^{-At}}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{A}{e^{At}-1}(u - e^{At}\sup(u_0)_+) - B \leq \dot{u} \leq \frac{A}{e^{At}-1}(u-u_0) + B.$$

□

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.**

4.2.1. *Smoothness.*

As in the proof of Proposition 3.2, we can construct a sequence of functions $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} u_m(.,t) \in SPSH(\Omega), & \\ \dot{u}_m = \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ u_m = \varphi_m \rightrightarrows \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times[0,T), \\ u_m = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(\epsilon_m,T), \\ u_m = u_{0,m} \searrow u_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega}\times\{0\}, \\ u = \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} u_m. & \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

where $\epsilon_m \searrow 0$.

$\forall \epsilon \in (0,T), \forall m \gg 1$, $u_m(.,\epsilon)$ verifies

$$\begin{cases} (dd^c u_m(z,\epsilon))^n = F_m(z) \quad \text{on } \ \Omega, \\ u_m(z,\epsilon) = \varphi(z,\epsilon) \quad \text{on } \ \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

where $F_m(z) = \exp(\dot{u}_m(z,\epsilon) + Au_m(z,\epsilon) - f(z,\epsilon))$.

By Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 3.10, we have, for $m \gg 1$,

$$F_m(z) \leq C_1 e^{-\frac{u(z,\epsilon/2)}{\epsilon/2}} \leq C_2 e^{-\frac{2u_0(z)}{\epsilon}}$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depend only on $\Omega, \epsilon, T, A, f, \varphi$.

By Skoda's theorem (see [Sko72]), we have $F_m \in L^p(\bar{\Omega})$ for any $p > 1$.

Applying Kolodziej theorem (Theorem B [Kol98]), we have

$$\|u_m(.,\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

where C is independent of m.

Hence, the weak solution u satisfies

$$\|u(.,\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

By Corollary 3.4, Proposition 3.9 and the case where u_0 is bounded ([Do15]), we have u is smooth on $\bar{\Omega}\times(\epsilon,T)$ and verifies

$$\dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + f(z,t) \tag{29}$$

on $\bar{\Omega}\times(\epsilon,T)$.

When $\epsilon \searrow 0$, we have u is smooth on $\bar{\Omega}\times(0,T)$ and verifies (29) on $\bar{\Omega}\times(0,T)$.

4.2.2. *Continuity at zero.*

Applying Lemma 3.7, we have

$$\liminf_{t\to 0} u(z,t) \geq u_0(z), \tag{30}$$

for any $z\in\bar{\Omega}$.

Note that u is the limit of a decreasing sequence of smooth functions, then $u\in USC(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T))$. We have

$$\limsup_{t\to 0} u(z,t) \leq u_0(z), \tag{31}$$

for any $z\in\bar{\Omega}$.

Combining (30) and (31), we obtain

$$\lim_{t\to 0} u(z,t) = u_0(z).$$

Hence, by the dominated convergence theorem, $u(.,t)\to u_0$ in L^1, as $t\to 0$.

5. A PRIORI ESTIMATES

In this section, we will prove a priori estimates which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

We suppose that Ω be a bounded smooth strictly pseudoconvex domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$, $C_0, A, T, N_1,..., N_l>0$ and $a_1,...a_l\in\Omega$. We also suppose that φ, g are smooth functions in $\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T]$ and u_0 is a plurisubharmonic function in Ω satisfying

$$\|g\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T])} + \|\varphi\|_{C^4(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T])} \leq C_0, \tag{32}$$

$$u_0 \geq \sum_{j=1}^{l} N_j \log|z-a_j| - C_0, \tag{33}$$

where $\|.\|_{C^k(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T])}$ is defined by

$$\|\phi\|_{C^k(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T])} = \sum_{|j_1|+j_2\leq 2} \sup_{\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T]} |D_x^{j_1}D_t^{j_2}\phi|,$$

for any $\phi\in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T])$.

Throughout this section, unless specified otherwise, we always assume that u_0 is smooth and strictly plurisubharmonic in $\bar{\Omega}$. The main result of this section is following

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that* $u\in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + g(z,t) \quad on \;\; \Omega\times(0,T), \\ u=\varphi \quad on \;\; \partial\Omega\times[0,T), \\ u(.,0) = u_0 \quad on \;\; \bar{\Omega}. \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

Then for any $0<\epsilon<T$ *and* $K\Subset\bar{\Omega}\setminus\{a_1,...,a_l\}$, *there exists* $C_1, C_2>0$ *depending on* $\Omega, T, C_0, N_1,..., N_l, a_1,..., a_l, \epsilon, K$ *such that*

$$|u(z,t)| + |\dot{u}(z,t)| + \Delta u(z,t) \leq C, \;\; \forall (z,t)\in K\times(\epsilon, T). \tag{35}$$

By Lemma 3.7, we have

$$\sup\varphi \geq u(z,t) \geq u_0(z) - C(t) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{l} N_j \log|z-a_j| - C_0 - C(t).$$

By Lemma 4.1, we also have the bounds of $\dot{u}$. Then it remains to estimate Δu.

5.1. **Bounds on ∇u.**

Let $0<\epsilon<T$. We need to estimate ∇u near $\partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)$ in order to bound Δu on $\partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)$.

Lemma 5.2. *For any $T>\epsilon>0$, there exists $B>0$ depending only on $n,\Omega,T,C_0,a_1,...,a_l$, $N_1,...,N_l,\epsilon$ such that*

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)} |\nabla u| \leq B.$$

Proof. For any $(z,t)\in\partial\Omega\times(0,T), \xi\in T_{\mathbb{R},z}\partial\Omega$, we have

$$|u_\xi(z,t)| = |\varphi_\xi(z,t)| \leq C_0.$$

It remains to show that , for any $(z,t)\in\partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)$,

$$|u_\eta(z,t)| \leq B,$$

where η is an interior normal vector of $\partial\Omega$ at z, $\|\eta\|=1$.
We need to construct functions $\underline{u}, h\in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ such that

$$\underline{u}\leq u\leq h \text{ on } \bar{\Omega}\times[0,T),$$
$$\underline{u}=\varphi=h \text{ on } \partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T),$$

and $|\nabla\underline{u}|, |\nabla h|$ are bounded by a constant which depending only on n,Ω, T, C_0,a_1,...,a_l, N_1,...,N_l, ϵ.
Let $\underline{u}_0$ be a smooth plurisubharmonic function on $\bar{\Omega}$ such that $\underline{u}_0\leq u_0$ and

$$\underline{u}_0 = \sum N_j\log|z-a_j| - (1+\epsilon)C_0 \quad \text{near } \partial\Omega.$$

Let h_0 be a harmonic function on $\bar{\Omega}$ such that

$$h_0 = \sum N_j\log|z-a_j| - (1+\epsilon)C_0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Let $\zeta:\mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ be a smooth increasing function such that $\zeta(0)=0$, $\zeta(\epsilon)=1$.
We consider the functions

$$\underline{\varphi}(z,t) = (1-\zeta(t))h_0(z) + \zeta(t)\varphi(z,t),$$
$$\underline{u}(z,t) = \underline{u}_0(z) + \underline{\varphi}(z,t) - h_0(z) + B_1\rho(z),$$

where $\rho\in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $dd^c\rho\geq dd^c|z|^2$ and $\rho|_{\partial\Omega}=0$ and $B_1\geq\frac{1}{n}\exp(\sup\dot{\underline{\varphi}} + 3A\sup|\underline{\varphi}| + \sup|g|)$ such that $\underline{u}(.,t)\in SPSH(\bar{\Omega})$ for any $t\in[0,T]$.
We have

$\underline{u}(z,0) = \underline{u}_0(z) + B_1\rho(z) \leq u_0(z)$,
$\underline{u}|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)} = \underline{\varphi}|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)} \leq \varphi|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)}$,
$\dot{\underline{u}} - \log\det\underline{u}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + A\underline{u} - g(z,t) \leq \dot{\underline{\varphi}} - n\log B_1 + A(\sup\underline{u}_0 + 2\sup|\underline{\varphi}|) + \sup|g| \leq 0.$

It follows from Corollary 2.5 that $\underline{u} \leq u$.

Now, let $h : \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a spatial harmonic function satisfying

$$h|_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T)} = \varphi|_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T)}.$$

We have

$$\begin{cases} \underline{u} \leq u \leq h \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T), \\ \underline{u} = \varphi = h \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (\epsilon, T). \end{cases}$$

Then for any $(z, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (\epsilon, T)$, we have

$$\underline{u}_\eta(z, t) \leq u_\eta(z, t) \leq h_\eta(z, t),$$

where η is an interior normal vector of $\partial\Omega$ at z, $\|\eta\| = 1$.
Hence

$$|u_\eta(z, t)| \leq \sup\{|\underline{u}_\eta(z, t)|, |h_\eta(z, t)|\} \leq B_2,$$

where $B_2 > 0$ depends only on n,Ω, T, C_0,a_1,...,a_l, N_1,...,N_l, ϵ.

□

Lemma 5.3. *For any $T > 2\epsilon > 0$ and $K \Subset \bar{\Omega} \setminus \{a_1, ..., a_l\}$, there exists $B > 0$ depending only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ such that*

$$\sup_{K\times(2\epsilon,T)} |\nabla u| \leq B.$$

Proof. We will use the technique of Blocki as in [Blo08].

By Lemma 4.1, there exists $M > 0$ depending only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, \epsilon$, $N_1, ..., N_l$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u} \leq M(\sum \log_- |z - a_j| + 1) \ \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \times [\epsilon, T), \\ \dot{u} + Au - g \leq M(\sum \log_- |z - a_j| + 1) \ \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \times [\epsilon, T), \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

where $\log_- |z - a_j| = \max\{-\log |z - a_j|, 0\}$.

Let $f_1, ..., f_N \in \{f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C}^n, C) : \log |f| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} M \log |z - a_j| + O(1)\}$ satisfy

$$\prod_{j=1}^{l} |z - a_j|^{2M} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} |f_j|^2.$$

The f_j are in fact polynomials, which could be written explicitly, but tediously, using the multinomial formula. Note that the choice of $f_1, ..., f_N$ depends only on $a_1, ..., a_l, M$. Then there exists $C_1 > 0$ depending only on $\Omega, a_1, ..., a_l, M$ such that

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |(f_j)_\alpha|.|f_j|}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |f_j|^2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{C_1}{|z - a_j|} \text{ on } \Omega. \tag{37}$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $0 \in \Omega$ and $C_0 > 1$. We denote, for $(z, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [\epsilon, T)$,

$$\begin{gathered}k(t) = (n+1)\log(t-\epsilon),\\ \gamma(u) = \log(3C_0 - u) - \log(2C_0 - u),\\ \psi_j = f_j \nabla u,\ \forall j = 1, ..., N,\\ \psi_0 = \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} |\psi_j|^2,\\ \psi = \log\psi_0 + \gamma(u) + k(t) + \eta|z|^2,\end{gathered}$$

where $\eta = \frac{1}{4(diam(\Omega)+1)^2}$.

We will show that

$$\sup_{\bar\Omega\times[\epsilon,T']} \psi \leq \tilde{B},\ \forall T' \in (\epsilon, T),$$

where $\tilde{B}$ depends only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, a_1, ..., a_l,\ N_1, ..., N_l, K, \epsilon$.

Let $(z_0, t_0) \in \bar\Omega \times [\epsilon, T']$ satisfy

$$\psi(z_0, t_0) = \sup_{\bar\Omega\times[\epsilon,T']} \psi.$$

By an orthogonal change of coordinates, we can assume that $(u_{\alpha\bar\beta}(z_0, t_0))$ is diagonal. For convenience, we denote $\lambda_\alpha = u_{\alpha\bar\alpha}(z_0, t_0)$.

Assume that

$$\psi(z_0, t_0) \geq B_1 + 1, \tag{38}$$

where $B_1 \geq \sup_{\partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)} \psi$ is a constant depending only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0,\ a_1, ..., a_l,\ N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ.

Then $z_0 \in \Omega \setminus \{a_1, ..., a_l\}$,$t_0 \in (\epsilon, T']$. Hence, $\dot\psi(z_0, t_0) \geq 0$, $\nabla\psi(z_0, t_0) = 0$ and $(\psi_{\alpha\bar\beta}(z_0, t_0))$ is negative. We have, at (z_0, t_0),

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{(\psi_0)_\alpha}{\psi_0} = -\gamma'(u)u_\alpha - \eta\bar{z}_\alpha,\\ L(\psi) := \dot\psi - \sum u^{\alpha\bar\beta}\psi_{\alpha\bar\beta} \geq 0, \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

where $(u^{\alpha\bar\beta})$ is the transpose of inverse matrix of Hessian matrix $(u_{\alpha\bar\beta})$.
We compute, at (z_0, t_0),

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\gamma(u)+k(t)+\eta|z|^2) &= \gamma'(u)\dot{u}+k'(t)-\gamma'(u)\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}-\gamma''(u)\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}u_\alpha u_{\bar{\beta}}-\eta\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}\\
&= \gamma'(u)(\dot{u}-n)+k'(t)-\gamma''(u)\sum\frac{|u_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha}-\eta\sum\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha}.\\
L(\log\psi_0) &= \frac{\dot{\psi}_0}{\psi_0}-\sum\frac{(\psi_0)_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\\
&= \frac{\dot{\psi}_0}{\psi_0}-\sum_{j,\alpha}\frac{|(\psi_j)_\alpha|^2+|(\psi_j)_{\bar{\alpha}}|^2+2Re(\langle(\psi_j)_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}},\psi_j\rangle)}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\\
&\leq \frac{\dot{\psi}_0}{\psi_0}-\sum_{j,\alpha}\frac{2Re(\langle(\psi_j)_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}},\psi_j\rangle)}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\\
&= \frac{\dot{\psi}_0}{\psi_0}-\sum_{j,\alpha}\frac{2Re(\lambda_\alpha(f_j)_\alpha\bar{f}_ju_{\bar{\alpha}})}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0}-\sum_{j,\alpha}\frac{2Re(\langle f_j\nabla u_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}},\psi_j\rangle)}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\\
&= \frac{2Re\langle\nabla\dot{u},\nabla u\rangle}{|\nabla u|^2}-\sum_{j,\alpha}\frac{2Re((f_j)_\alpha\bar{f}_ju_{\bar{\alpha}})}{\psi_0}-\sum_{\alpha}\frac{2Re(\langle\nabla u_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}},\nabla u\rangle)}{\lambda_\alpha|\nabla u|^2}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\\
&= \frac{2Re(\langle L(\nabla u),\nabla u\rangle)}{|\nabla u|^2}-\sum_{j,\alpha}\frac{2Re((f_j)_\alpha\bar{f}_ju_{\bar{\alpha}})}{\psi_0}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\\
&= \frac{2Re(\langle -A\nabla u+\nabla g,\nabla u\rangle)}{|\nabla u|^2}-\sum_{j,\alpha}\frac{2Re((f_j)_\alpha\bar{f}_ju_{\bar{\alpha}})}{\psi_0}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\\
&\leq \frac{2|\nabla g|}{|\nabla u|}+\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{2nC_1}{|z-a_j||\nabla u|}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\psi) &\leq \frac{2|\nabla g|}{|\nabla u|}+\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{2nC_1}{|z-a_j||\nabla u|}+\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}+\gamma'(u)(\dot{u}-n)\\
&\quad +k'(t_0)-\gamma''(u)\sum\frac{|u_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha}-\eta\sum\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha}.
\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

By (39), we have,

$$\sum\frac{|(\psi_0)_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha\psi_0^2}\leq 2\sum\frac{(\gamma'(u))^2|u_\alpha|^2+\eta^2|z_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha}\leq 2(\gamma'(u))^2\sum\frac{|u_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha}+\frac{\eta}{2}\sum\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha}.\tag{41}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma'(u)=\frac{1}{2C_0-u}-\frac{1}{3C_0-u}=\frac{C_0}{(2C_0-u)(3C_0-u)},\\
&\gamma''(u)=\frac{1}{(2C_0-u)^2}-\frac{1}{(3C_0-u)^2}=\frac{C_0(5C_0-2u)}{(2C_0-u)^2(3C_0-u)^2},\\
&\gamma''(u)-2(\gamma'(u))^2\geq\frac{C_0^2}{(3C_0-u)^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have, by (40), (41),

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\psi) &\leq \frac{2|\nabla g|}{|\nabla u|}+\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{2nC_1}{|z-a_j||\nabla u|}+\gamma'(u)(\dot{u}-n)\\
&\quad +k'(t_0)-\frac{C_0^2}{(3C_0-u)^4}\sum\frac{|u_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha}-\frac{\eta}{2}\sum\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (36), (38), there exists $C_2 > 0$ depending only on n, Ω, T, C_0, $a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ such that

$$L(\psi) \leq C_2 - M\sum \log|z-a_j| + k'(t_0) - \frac{C_0^2}{(3C_0-u)^4}\sum\frac{|u_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha} - \frac{\eta}{2}\sum\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha}.$$

We can also assume that $C_2 - M\sum\log|z-a_j| > 0$.

By the condition $L(\psi)|_{(z_0,t_0)} \geq 0$, we have,

$$\frac{C_0^2}{(3C_0-u)^4}\sum\frac{|u_\alpha|^2}{\lambda_\alpha} + \frac{\eta}{2}\sum\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha} \leq C_2 - M\sum\log|z-a_j| + k'(t_0). \tag{42}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha} = \frac{\prod\limits_{\beta\neq\alpha}\lambda_\beta}{\prod\limits_{\beta=1}^{n}\lambda_\beta} &= (\prod_{\beta\neq\alpha}\lambda_\alpha)e^{-\dot{u}-Au+g}\\ &\geq \left(\frac{\eta}{2}\right)^{n-1}(C_2 - M\sum\log|z-a_j| + k'(t_0))^{-n+1}e^{-\dot{u}-Au+g}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (42),

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla u|^2 &\leq \frac{(3C_0-u)^4}{C_0^2}\left(\frac{2}{\eta}\right)^{n-1}(C_2 - M\sum\log|z-a_j| + k'(t_0))^n e^{\dot{u}+Au-g}\\ &\leq C_2\frac{(3C_0-u)^4}{C_0^2}e^{\dot{u}+Au-g}(1+C_2-M\sum\log|z-a_j|)^n(1+k'(t_0))^n\\ &\leq C_3\frac{(3C_0-u)^4}{C_0^2}e^{\dot{u}+Au-g}(1+k'(t_0))^n\prod|z-a_j|^{-M/2},\end{aligned}$$

where $C_3 > 0$ depends only on n, Ω, T, C_0, $a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ.

Then, by (36) and Lemma 3.7, we have,

$$|\nabla u|^2 \leq C_4\frac{(3C_0 + C(t_0) - u_0)^4}{C_0^2}(1+k'(t_0))^n\prod|z-a_j|^{-3M/2}, \tag{43}$$

where $C(t_0)$ is defined as in Lemma 3.7 and $C_4 > 0$ depends only on $C_3, M, a_1, ..., a_l$.

Note that $u_0 \geq \sum N_j\log|z-a_j| - C_0$. Then

$$|\nabla u|^2 \leq C_5(1+k'(t_0))^n\prod|z-a_j|^{-2M}, \tag{44}$$

where $C_5 > 0$ depends only on n, Ω, T, C_0, $a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ.

By (38) and (44), we have,

$$\frac{e^{B_1-2}}{(t_0-\epsilon)^{n+1}} = e^{B_1-2-k(t_0)} \leq \psi_0(z_0,t_0) \leq C_5(k'(t_0)+1)^n = C_5\left(\frac{t_0+n+1-\epsilon}{t_0-\epsilon}\right)^n. \tag{45}$$

Hence, $t_0 \geq t_1 > \epsilon$, where t_1 depends only on n, Ω, T, C_0, $a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ. We have, by (44),

$$\psi(z_0,t_0) \leq \tilde{B}, \tag{46}$$

where $\tilde{B} > B_1 + 1 > 0$ depends only on n, Ω, T, C_0, $a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ.

Note that $\tilde{B}$ is independent of T'. Then,

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}\times[\epsilon,T)} \psi \leq \tilde{B}.$$

In particular, there exists $B > 0$ depending only on n, Ω, T, C_0, $a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ such that

$$\sup_{K\times(2\epsilon,T)} |\nabla u| \leq B.$$

□

5.2. **Higher order estimates.**

Lemma 5.4. *For any $T > \epsilon > 0$, there exists $B > 0$ depending only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l, \epsilon$ such that*

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)} |D^2 u| \leq B.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 5.3, we can estimate $\dot{u}$ and ∇u near $\partial\Omega \times (\epsilon, T)$. Then the proof of this lemma is the same as the case $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ (see [Do15]). □

Using the 2-order estimates on $\partial\Omega \times (0, \epsilon)$, we will estimate Δu on $K \times (2\epsilon, T)$, for any $K \Subset \bar{\Omega} \setminus \{a_1, ..., a_l\}$.

Lemma 5.5. *For any $T > 2\epsilon > 0$ and $K \Subset \bar{\Omega} \setminus \{a_1, ..., a_l\}$, there exists $B > 0$ depending only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l$, K, ϵ such that*

$$\sup_{K\times(2\epsilon,T)} \Delta u \leq B.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 5.4, there exist $B_1, B_2 > 0$ depending only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, a_1, ..., a_l$, $N_1, ..., N_l, \epsilon$ such that

$$\sup_{\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)} (-u + u_\epsilon + |z|^2) \leq B_1, \tag{47}$$

$$B_1 + \sup_{\partial\Omega\times(\epsilon,T)} (t \log \Delta u - u + u_\epsilon + |z|^2) \leq B_2. \tag{48}$$

where $u_\epsilon = u(., \epsilon)$.

We consider the function $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [\epsilon, T))$ defined by

$$\phi = t \log \Delta u - u + u_\epsilon - B_3(t - \epsilon) + |z|^2,$$

where $B_3 = C_0(A + T + 1) + \log(n!) + n + 1$.

We will show that

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}\times(\epsilon,T)} \phi \leq B_2. \tag{49}$$

Indeed, if there exists $(z_0, t_0) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [\epsilon, T)$ satisfying

$$\phi(z_0, t_0) > B_2,$$

then $z_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 > \epsilon$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$\phi(z_0, t_0) = \sup_{\bar{\Omega}\times(\epsilon,t_0)} \phi.$$

Denote by L the operator

$$L(\psi) = \dot{\psi} - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}\psi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}, \ \ \forall \psi \in C^{\infty}(\bar{\Omega} \times [\epsilon, T)),$$

where $(u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}})$ is the transpose of inverse matrix of Hessian matrix $(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})$.

We have

$$L(\phi)|_{(z_0,t_0)} \geq 0.$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} L(\phi) &= t\frac{\Delta\dot{u}}{\Delta u} + \log \Delta u - \dot{u} - B_3 - t\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(\log \Delta u)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - (u_\epsilon)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \\ &\leq t\frac{\Delta\dot{u}}{\Delta u} + \log \Delta u - \dot{u} - B_3 - t\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(\log \Delta u)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + n - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 2.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(\phi) &\leq t\frac{\Delta\dot{u}}{\Delta u} + \log \Delta u - \dot{u} - B_3 - t\frac{\Delta \log \det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})}{\Delta u} + n - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \\ &= t\frac{\Delta(\dot{u} - \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}))}{\Delta u} + \log \Delta u - \dot{u} - B_3 + n - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \\ &= t\frac{-A\Delta u + \Delta g}{\Delta u} + \log \Delta u - \dot{u} - B_3 + n - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \\ &\leq t\frac{\Delta g}{\Delta u} + \log \Delta u - \dot{u} - B_3 + n - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 2.7, we have

$$\log \Delta u \leq \log n + \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) + (n-1)\log(\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} L(\phi) &\leq t\frac{\Delta g}{\Delta u} + \log n + \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) + (n-1)\log(\textstyle\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}) - \dot{u} - B_3 + n - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \\ &\leq t\frac{\Delta g}{\Delta u} + \log n - B_3 + n + Au - g + (n-1)\log(\textstyle\sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}) - \sum u^{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \\ &\leq t\frac{\Delta g}{\Delta u} + \log n - B_3 + n + (A+1)C_0 + \log((n-1)!) \\ &= t\frac{\Delta g}{\Delta u} + \log(n!) - B_3 + n + (A+1)C_0, \end{aligned}$$

where third inequality holds due to the conditions (32), (33) and the inequalities

$$(n-1)\log x - x \leq (n-1)\log(n-1) - (n-1), \ \ \forall x > 0,$$

and

$$\frac{(n-1)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \leq \exp\left(n-1\right).$$

Hence

$$L(\phi)|_{(z_0,t_0)} \leq C_0T + \log(n!) - B_3 + n + (A+1)C_0 < 0.$$

We have a contradiction. Thus

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}\times(\epsilon,T)} \phi \leq B_2.$$

In particular, there exists $B > 0$ depending only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, a_1, ..., a_l, N_1, ..., N_l, K, \epsilon$ such that

$$\sup_{K\times(2\epsilon,T)} \Delta u \leq B.$$

□

6. Proof of Theorem 1.4

6.1. **Smoothness.** As in the proof of Proposition 3.2, we can construct a sequence of functions $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} u_m(.,t) \in SPSH(\Omega), & \\ \dot{u}_m = \log\det(u_m)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - Au_m + f(z,t) & \text{on } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ u_m = \varphi_m \rightrightarrows \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times[0,T), \\ u_m = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(\epsilon_m,T), \\ u_m = u_{0,m} \searrow u_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega}\times\{0\}, \\ u = \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} u_m. & \end{cases} \tag{50}$$

where $\epsilon_m \searrow 0$.

Applying Theorem 5.1, we obtain, for any $K \Subset \bar{\Omega}\setminus\{a_1, ..., a_l\}$ and $0 < \epsilon < T$,

$$\|u_m\|_{C^2(K\times[\epsilon,T))} \leq C_{K,\epsilon},$$

where $C_{K,\epsilon}$ depends only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, N_1, ..., N_l, a_1, ..., a_l, \epsilon, K$.

It follows from $C^{2,\alpha}$-estimates (see, for example, [Do15]) that

$$\|u_m\|_{C^{2,\gamma}(K\times[\epsilon,T))} \leq C_{K,\epsilon,\gamma},$$

where γ and $C_{K,\epsilon,\gamma}$ depend only on $n, \Omega, T, C_0, N_1, ..., N_l, a_1, ..., a_l, \epsilon, K$.

By Ascoli theorem, we obtain

$$u_m \overset{C^{2,\gamma/2}(K\times[\epsilon,T'])}{\longrightarrow} u, \quad \text{as } m\to\infty, \tag{51}$$

where $\epsilon < T' < T$.

Then $u \in C^{2,\gamma/2}(K\times[\epsilon,T'])$. Applying regularity theorem (see, for example, [Do15]), we have $u \in C^\infty(K\times(\epsilon,T'))$. Hence, $u \in C^\infty(K\times(0,T))$.

Fix $0 < r < \min\limits_{j\neq k}|a_j - a_k|$. We need to show that $u \in C^\infty(B_r(a_j)\times(\epsilon_A(N_j),T))$ when $T > \epsilon_A(N_j)$.

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. If $A = 0$, we have, for $t = \epsilon_0(N_j) + 2\epsilon = \frac{N_j}{2n} + \epsilon$,

$$(dd^cu_m)^n = e^{\dot{u}_m(z,\epsilon_0(N_j)+2\epsilon) - f(z,\epsilon_0(N_j)+2\epsilon)}dV = d\mu.$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 3.10, we have, for $m \gg 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\exp\left(\dot{u}_m(z,\epsilon_0(N_j)+2\epsilon)-f(z,\epsilon_0(N_j)+2\epsilon)\right) &\leq C_1\exp\left(\tfrac{u_m(z,\epsilon_0+2\epsilon)-u_m(z,\epsilon)}{\epsilon_0(N_j)+\epsilon}\right)\\ &\leq C_2\exp\left(-\tfrac{u_m(z,\epsilon)}{\epsilon_0(N_j)+\epsilon}\right)\\ &\leq C_3\exp\left(-\tfrac{u_m(z,0)}{\epsilon_0(N_j)+\epsilon}\right)\\ &\leq C_3\exp\left(-\tfrac{u_0(z)}{\epsilon_0(N_j)+\epsilon}\right)\\ &= C_3\exp\left(-\tfrac{2nu_0(z)}{N_j+2n\epsilon}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ depend only on $\Omega, \epsilon, T, f, \varphi$.

Then, we have, for $K \Subset B_r(a_j)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(K) &\leq C_3\int_K \exp\left(-\tfrac{2nu_0(z)}{N_j+2n\epsilon}\right)dV\\ &\leq C_4\int_K \exp\left(-\tfrac{2nN_j\log|z-a_j|}{N_j+2n\epsilon}\right)dV\\ &= C_4\int_K |z-a_j|^{-\frac{2nN_j}{N_j+2n\epsilon}}dV\\ &\leq C_5\left(\int_K |z-a_j|^{-\frac{2nN_j}{N_j+n\epsilon}}dV\right)^{\frac{N_j+n\epsilon}{N_j+2n\epsilon}}\left(\int_K dV\right)^{\frac{n\epsilon}{N_j+2n\epsilon}}\\ &\leq C_6\left(\int_K dV\right)^{\frac{n\epsilon}{N_j+2n\epsilon}}\\ &\leq C_7(Cap(K))^2.\end{aligned}$$

where $C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7 > 0$ are independent of m. The last inequality holds due to [AT84] and [Zer01].

Applying Kolodziej theorem (Theorem B [Kol98]), we have

$$\|u_m(.,\epsilon_A(N_j)+2\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty(B_r(a_j))} \leq C_8,$$

where C_8 is independent of m. Then $\|u(.,\epsilon_A(N_j)+2\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty(B_r(a_j))} \leq C_8$. Applying the case "$u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$" (see [Do15]) , we have $u \in C^\infty(B_r(a_j)\times(\epsilon_A(N_j)+2\epsilon, T))$.

Let $\epsilon \to 0$. We have $u \in C^\infty(B_r(a_j)\times(\epsilon_A(N_j), T))$.

If $A > 0$, by the same arguments, we also obtain $u \in C^\infty(B_r(a_j)\times(\epsilon_A(N_j), T))$.

Thus $u \in C^\infty(Q)$.

By (51), for any $(z,t) \in \bar{\Omega}\setminus\{a_1, ..., a_l\}\times(0,T)$,

$$\dot{u} = \log\det(u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) - Au + f(z,t). \tag{52}$$

Taking the limits, we obtain (52) on Q.

6.2. **Singularity.** Let $j \in \{1, ..., l\}$. By Proposition 3.10, we have $u(a_j, t) = -\infty$ for any $t \in [0, \epsilon_A(n_j))$.

We need to show that if $n_j = N_j$ then $\nu_{u(.,t)}(a_j) = k(N_j, t)$.

By the proof of Proposition 3.10, we have, for any $t \in [0, \epsilon_A(N_j))$,

$$\nu_{u(.,t)}(a_j) \geq k(N_j, t), \tag{53}$$

Then, it remains to show that

$$\nu_{u(.,t)}(a_j) \leq k(N_j, t), \tag{54}$$

for any $t \in [0, \epsilon_A(N_j))$.

If there exist $t_0 \in (0, \epsilon_A(N_j))$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\nu_{u(.,t_0)}(a_j) \geq k(N_j, t_0) + \epsilon$$

then, by Proposition 3.10, there exists $t_1 > \epsilon_A(N_j)$ such that

$$\nu_{u(.,t_1)}(a_j) > 0.$$

This contradicts the smoothness of u on Q. Then we obtain (54).

Combining (53) and (54), we obtain

$$\nu_{u(.,t)}(a_j) = k(N_j, t).$$

6.3. **Continuity at zero.**

a) Convergence in L^1.

Applying Lemma 3.7, we have

$$\liminf_{t\to 0} u(z,t) \geq u_0(z), \tag{55}$$

for any $z \in \bar{\Omega}$.

Note that u is the limit of a decreasing sequence of smooth functions, then $u \in USC(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T))$. We have

$$\limsup_{t\to 0} u(z,t) \leq u_0(z), \tag{56}$$

for any $z \in \bar{\Omega}$.

Combining (55) and (56), we obtain

$$\lim_{t\to 0} u(z,t) = u_0(z).$$

Hence, by the dominated convergence theorem, $u(., t) \to u_0$ in L^1, as $t \to 0$.

b) Convergence in capacity

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a neighbouhood of $\bar{\Omega}$. We need to show that there exists an open set U_ϵ such that

$$Cap_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\bar{\Omega} \setminus U_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon$$

and

$$u(., t_{k_m}) \rightrightarrows u_0 \text{ on } U_\epsilon \cap \bar{\Omega}.$$

Indeed, by quasicontinuity of plurisubharmonic function, there exists $K_\epsilon \Subset \Omega$ such that

$$Cap_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\bar{\Omega} \setminus Int(K_\epsilon)) \leq \epsilon$$

and u_0 is continuous on K_ϵ.

By Lemma 3.7 and Dini theorem, for any $t_k \searrow 0$, there exists a subsequence $t_{k_m} \searrow 0$ such that

$$u(., t_{k_m}) \rightrightarrows u_0 \text{ on } K_\epsilon, \text{ as } m \to \infty.$$

Then

$$u(., t) \rightrightarrows u_0 \text{ on } K_\epsilon, \text{ as } t \to 0.$$

References

[AT84] H. ALEXANDER, B. TAYLOR:*Comparison of two capacities in* $\mathbb{C}^n$*.* Math. Z. **186**(1984), 407–417.

[BG13] S. BOUCKSOM, V. GUEDJ: Regularizing properties of the Kähler-Ricci flow. *An introduction to the Kähler-Ricci flow,*189–237, Lecture Notes in Math., 2086, Springer, Cham, 2013.

[Blo08] Z. BLOCKI: *A gradient estimate in the Calabi-Yau theorem.* Math. Ann.**344**(2009), 317–327.

[Bou11] S. BOUCKSOM: Monge-Ampère equations on complex manifolds with boundary.*Complex Monge-Ampère equations and geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics,* 257-282, Lecture Notes in Math., 2038, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.

[Cao85] H-D.CAO: *Deformation of Kähler metrics to Kähler-Einstein metrics on compact Kähler manifolds.* Invent. Math. **81** (1985), no. 2, 359–372.

[CC95] L. CAFFARELLI, X. CABRE:*Fully nonlinear elliptic equations,* Colloquium publications 43, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995

[CKNS85] L. CAFFARELLI, J. KOHN, L. NIRENBERG, J. SPRUCK:*The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. II. Complex Monge-Ampère, and uniform elliptic, equations.*C.P.A.M. **38** (1985) no. 2, 209–252

[Do15] H-S. DO:*Degenerate complex Monge-Ampére flows on strictly pseudoconvex domains.* [arXiv:math.CV/150107167]

[DL14] E. DI NEZZA, H.-C. LU: *Uniqueness and short time regularity of the weak Kähler- Ricci flow.* [arXiv:math.CV/14117958]

[EGZ14] P. EYSSIDIEUX, V. GUEDJ, A. ZERIAHI: *Weak solutions to degenerate complex Monge-Ampère flows I.* Math. Ann. **362** (2015), no. 3-4, 931–963.

[GT83] D. GILBARG, N. TRUDINGER:*Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Second edition.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften **224.**Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. xiii+513 pp.

[Gua98] B. GUAN:*The Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equations and regularity of the pluri-complex Green function.* Comm.Anal. Geom. **6** (1998), no. 4, 687–703.

[GZ13] V. GUEDJ, A. ZERIAHI: *Regularizing properties of the twisted Kähler - Ricci flow.* [arXiv:math.CV/13064089v1]

[HL10] Z. HOU, Q. LI: *Energy functionals and complex Monge-Ampère equations.* J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **9** (2010) no.3, 463–476.

[IS13] C. IMBERT, L. SILVERSTRE: An introduction to fully nonlinear parabolic equations. *An introduction to the Kähler-Ricci flow,*7-88, Lecture Notes in Math., 2086, Springer, Cham, 2013.

[Kol98] S.KOLODZIEJ:*The complex Monge-Ampère equation.* Acta Math. **180** (1998), no.1, 69–117.

[Kryl96] N.V. KRYLOV: *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Hölder spaces,* Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 12 (American Mathematical Society)

[Lieb96] G.M. LIEBERMAN: *Second order parabolic differential equations*(World Scientific, River Edge, 1996).

[Siu87] Y.T. SIU: *Lectures on Hermitian-Einstein metrics for stable bundles and Kähler-Einstein metrics.* DMV Seminar, 8. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1987.

[Sko72] H.SKODA: *Sous-ensembles analytiques d'ordre fini ou infini dans* $\mathbb{C}^n$*.* Bull. Soc. Math. France **100** (1972), 353–408.

[Yau78] S.T. YAU: *On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation.*I. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **31** (1978), no. 3, 339–411.

[Zer01] A.ZERIAHI:*Volume and capacity of sublevel sets of a Lelong class of plurisubharmonic functions.*Indiana Univ. Math. J.**50** (2001), no.1, 671–703.

E-mail address: `hoangson.do.vn@gmail.com`